REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

The subject matter of claim 6 has been integrated into claim 1, and claim 6 has been canceled. This amendment was not presented earlier due to the unforeseeability of the remarks presented in the Final Rejection.

Claims 1-3, 7, and 8 were rejected, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Chan et al. (US 6,504,634) in view of Keller et al. (US 6,690,888). Claim 5 was rejected, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Chan et al. (US 6,504,634) in view of Keller et al. (US 6,690,888) and Ikeda et al. (US 7,016,612). Claim 6 was rejected, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Chan et al. (US 6,504,634) in view of Keller et al. (US 6,690,888) and Graves et al. (US 2002/0196506). To the extent these rejections may be deemed applicable to the amended claims, the Applicants respectfully traverse based on the points set forth below.

The invention defined by claim 1 relates to an optical wireless communication system having a transmitter and a receiver, wherein the transmitter transmits a first optical signal to the receiver, and the receiver transmits, to the

transmitter, a second optical signal that carries information of the light-receiving level of the first optical signal. Further, the transmitter receives, in each of a plurality of light-receiving elements, the second optical signal at a level corresponding to a difference in direction between an optical axis of the receiver and an optical axis of the transmitter.

In a condition that none of the light-receiving levels received by the light-receiving elements exceeds a predetermined value, transmission of the first optical signal is stopped. On the other hand, in a condition that at least one of the light-receiving levels exceeds the predetermined value, transmission of the first optical signal is continued or restarted. Therefore, when a difference in direction of an optical axis between the receiver and the transmitter is large, the transmitter stops outputting the first optical signal, and when the difference is sufficiently small such that the transmitter is directed toward the receiver, the transmitter continues or restarts outputting the first optical signal to the receiver.

Accordingly, the transmitter of claim 1 provides an advantage in that it can prevent the transmission light of the first optical signal from being emitted carelessly to the surroundings around the receiver. That is, the transmitter

advantageously eliminates an adverse influence on peripheral devices or the environment (see specification page 11, lines 15-18).

The Final Rejection acknowledges that Chan and Keller do not teach or suggest stopping the transmission of an optical signal until the level of light exceeds a predetermined value, as previously recited in claim 6 and now recited in claim 1 (see Final Rejection, sentence bridging pages 7 and 8). To overcome this deficiency, the Final Rejection proposes that Graves suggests modifying the combined teachings of Chan and Keller to incorporate this feature (see page 8, first paragraph).

However, the Applicants note that Graves discloses an atmospheric optical data transmission system including first and second transceivers. In this system, each transceiver determines a curvature of a wavefront of light received from the other transceiver and modifies the curvature in response to the determined curvature (see Graves, abstract).

More specifically, Graves discloses a method of using time drain multiplexing in which each transceiver intermittently transmits and receives light waves. That is, when one receiver is transmitting light waves, the other transceiver is only receiving, and vice-versa for short time periods (see page 9, paragraph [0057]). Therefore, each receiver alternately performs

transmission and reception of light waves every predetermined short time period regardless of a level of each received light wave. In other words, after receiving first light waves for a short time period, each receiver automatically restarts transmission of second light waves.

Thus, Graves fails to teach or suggest the feature now recited in claim 1 of stopping the transmission of an optical signal in a condition that none of the levels detected from another received optical signal exceeds a predetermined value. In this case, there is a probability that a first transceiver may carelessly emit an optical signal to peripheral devices, or the environment, other than a second transceiver that is planned to receive the signal. That is, the first transceiver adversely influences peripheral devices or the environment if the optical signal transmission is not stopped.

In accordance with the above discussion, the Applicants respectfully submit that Chan, Keller, and Graves, considered individually or in combination, do not anticipate or render obvious the subject matter now defined by claim 1. Therefore, allowance of claim 1 and all claims dependent therefrom is warranted.

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

If any issues remain which may best be resolved through a telephone communication, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at the local Washington, D.C. telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 14, 2007
JEL/DWW/att

James E. Ledbetter
Registration No. 28,732

Attorney Docket No. L8734.03102
STEVENS DAVIS, MILLER & MOSHER, L.L.P.
1615 L Street, N.W., Suite 850
P.O. Box 34387
Washington, D.C. 20043-4387
Telephone: (202) 785-0100
Facsimile: (202) 408-5200